

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-45 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 40 have been amended, and claims 43 - 45 have been added. Support for the amended material and the material of the added claims can be found in the original specification, citations to which will be provided in the discussion below.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 40 have been amended to clarify the scope of the invention. Support for the amended material can be found in the original specification at, for example, page 4, line 17-22 and page 7, line 9-10. Additional support can be found at page 7, lines 21-23 and page 8, lines 4-9. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 1-42 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 to Meyer et al. ("Meyer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,608 to Dillingham ("Dillingham"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,748 to Deen et al. ("Deen"). Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the rejected claims as amended.

As the PTO provides in MPEP §2143, "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." Furthermore, under MPEP §2142, "[i]f the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness." It is submitted that the Office action does not factually support a prima facie case of obviousness for the following, mutually exclusive, reasons.

*Cited References Do Not Teach the Claimed Subject Matter*

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach the claimed subject matter. For example, independent claim 1, as amended, recites, “the protocol allows *a user* to perform remote web content authoring *and user rights administration* operations” and “administering user rights to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed *without requiring software*, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation.” By contrast, the cited text of Meyer does not describe the operation of administering user rights. Additionally, Meyer requires the installation and use of an “agent” on each client computer, wherein the client computer is accessed when a “web browser makes a request to the agent” (col. 3, line 35-50). Then, “the agent preferably executes a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) program which pulls selected data from the operating system of the computer” (col. 3, line 54-57). Thus, the primary reference, Meyer, specifically requires executable agent software to perform operations, whereas claim 1 precludes the execution of such software.

The Dillingham and Deen references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Meyer, as their cited text fails to teach or suggest administering user rights without requiring software installed on the user work station. Although not cited in reference to claim 1, the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,097 to Shrader et al. (“Shrader”) likewise fails to remedy the deficiencies of Meyer, Dillingham, and Deen. Whereas claim 1, for example, recites, “the protocol allows *a user* to perform remote web content authoring and user rights administration operations,” Shrader, by contrast is directed toward the tasks of *network administrators*. For example, an “object of this invention is to. . .enable[s] network administrators to easily retrieve information on a DCE cell and execute management actions. . .” Thus, the Applicant’s invention creates efficiencies which Shrader does not anticipate.

Accordingly, the cited references, taken either singly or in combination, fail to teach or

suggest all the limitations of claim 1 as required by MPEP § 2143, and the claim is allowable for at least this reason. Claims 2-11 depend from and further limit claim 1 and are allowable as well for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 12, 23, 34, and 40 each contain a limitation that is similar to that described above with respect to claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1. Claims 13-22, 24-33, 35-39, and 41-42 depend from and further limit their respective independent claim and are allowable as well.

#### **New Claims**

Claim 43 has been added and includes the element of “giving the user first access control rights to the first network object; and using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, assigning new access control rights to the first network object to a second user in response to an action of the user.” Support for this element can be found, for example, at page 8, lines 7-14 and page 4, line 17 to page 5, line 10. As described in detail above, the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest such an element. Accordingly, claim 43 and claims 44 and 45, which depend from and further limit claim 43, are in a condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/394,590  
Reply to Office action of August 20, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 26530.3  
Customer No. 27683

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-45 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

*Tf T. Bliss*

Timothy F. Bliss  
Registration No. 50,925

Date: November 20, 2003  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789  
Telephone: 972/739-8638  
Facsimile: 972/692-9101  
File No. 26530.3 / IDR-341  
R-60056\_1.DOC

EXPRESS MAIL NO.: EV333435136US

DATE OF DEPOSIT: November 20, 2003

This paper and fee are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Post Office to Addressee service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop RCE, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

*Gayle Conner*  
Gayle Conner